



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/820,057 03/18/97 TURNER

C 109026-0038

EXAMINER

LM01/0817

STEVEN J. FRANK  
CESARI AND MCKENNA  
30 ROWES WHARF  
BOSTON MA 02110

LEWIS, D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2778

DATE MAILED:

08/17/00

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

## Interview Summary

Application No.  
08/820,057

Applicant(s)  
Turner et al.

Examiner  
David L Lewis

Group Art Unit  
2778



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) David L Lewis (3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Steven Frank (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Aug 7, 2000

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 1

Identification of prior art discussed:

Kazan (5220316)

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant restates the arguments of the response filed on 2/15/00, wherein the nonlinear element of Kazan's figure 4 is disposed between one electrode and a contact lead on the top side of the display substrate, and therefore Kazan does not read on the claim language required by claim 1. The Examiner's disagrees, because when the claims are view in their broadest interpretation, the nonlinear element shown in the center of the display matrix (column 2, row 2), viewed from a two-dimensional perspective, reads on the nonlinear element being disposed between sets of electrodes on the north/south and east/west sides, therefore reading on claim 1. To overcome the Kazan reference the claims language would have to distinguish a three-dimensional perspective, wherein the nonlinear element is sandwiched between the two electrodes giving the order from top to bottom of, first electrode, nonlinear element, display, then second electrode. This change would however require a new search and consideration.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.